



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/010,587	11/13/2001	Chris A. Wolfe	020075	4346
23596 7590 04/04/2008 QUALCOMM INCORPORATED 5775 MOREHOUSE DR. SAN DIEGO, CA 92121				
EXAMINER BURGESS, BARBARA N				
ART UNIT 2157		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 04/04/2008		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

us-docketing@qualcomm.com
kascanla@qualcomm.com
nanm@qualcomm.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/010,587

Applicant(s)

WOLFE ET AL.

Examiner

BARBARA N. BURGESS

Art Unit

2157

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 December 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SE/US)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action is in response Appeal Brief filed December 5, 2007. Claims 2, 11 were previously cancelled. Examiner has withdrawn the finality of claims 1, 3-10, 12-25 hereby reopening prosecution. Claims 1, 3-10, 12-25 are presented for further consideration.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 3-10, 12-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bloom (US Patent Publication 2006/0020366 A1) in view of Harvey et al. (hereinafter "Harvey", US Patent 6,519,568 B1).

As per claims 1, 10, 19, Bloom discloses a system, service hub, and method for providing online service reports to user subscribers, wherein the service reports contain service information about services rendered by one or more service providers operating using wireless communications at the direction of a service administrator, the system comprising:

- A service hub coupled between the service administrator and the one or more service providers, the service hub also including a decoder that decodes the

service information from one or more operational messages comprising macro messages to convey the service information exchanged between the service administrator and the one or more service providers (paragraphs [0038, 0063, 0074, 0089, 0093], Bloom teaches the hub receiving orders, delivery information, shipment information from customers as well as workers. The information contains digits and values (macros) that represent different things. For example "open" defines an order status, "new" defines order detail status, "S" means a single-item case. SKU size and Temperature Codes can be set to values as well. These are all macros used to give information concerning packages and deliveries);

- The macro messages being capable of a different meaning among the one or more service providers (paragraph [0074], Bloom discloses that each retailer can have its own database containing SKU and SKU related values which are specific to that retailer)
- A network server coupled between the service hub and the user subscribers via a communication network, the network server including logic to receive a request from a selected user subscriber, (paragraphs [0069-0070, 0074, 0103], Bloom discloses a server having applications ePD Shipping, ePD delivery for which customers can place orders and workers can upload shipment information).

Bloom does not explicitly disclose:

- the service hub including a receiver that receives access messages that define access rights for the user subscribers;

- and in response to subscriber's request, provide at least a portion of the selected service information to the selected user subscriber based on the access rights defined in the access message as defined by one or more access macro codes comprising the access messages.

However, the use and advantages of receiving access messages that define access rights of user subscribers and providing a portion of the service information based on the access rights is well-known to one of ordinary skill in the art as evidenced by Harvey (column 5, lines 20-20, column 26, lines 8-11, 27-60).

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to implement or incorporate Harvey's receiving access messages that define access rights of user subscribers and providing a portion of the service information based on the access rights in Bloom's system in order to determine who has access to resources and the type of access that have.

As per claims 3, 12, further Bloom discloses the system, service hub of claim 2 and 11 wherein the decoder comprises logic to decode the macro messages to determine the service information (paragraphs [0038, 0063, 0074, 0089, 0093]).

As per claims 4, 13, Bloom does not explicitly discloses the system and service hub of claims 1 and 10 wherein the service hub receives a control message containing definitions for the macro messages.

However, the use and advantages of receiving access messages that define access rights of user subscribers and providing a portion of the service information based on the access rights is well-known to one of ordinary skill in the art as evidenced by Harvey (column 5, lines 20-20, column 26, lines 8-11, 27-60).

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to implement or incorporate Harvey's receiving access messages that define access rights of user subscribers and providing a portion of the service information based on the access rights in Bloom's system in order to determine who has access to resources and the type of access that have.

As per claims 5, 14, Bloom discloses the system and service hub of claims 1 and 10 wherein the service hub includes a memory and logic to maintain a master status table that contains the service information describing services rendered by the one or more service providers (paragraphs [0074, 0151]).

As per claims 6, 15, Bloom further discloses the system and service hub of claims 1 and 10 wherein the network server includes logic to authenticate the selected user subscriber that makes the request (paragraphs [0014, 0035]).

As per claims 7, 16, Bloom discloses the system and service hub of claims 1 and 10 wherein the network server is coupled to the service hub via the communication network (paragraph [0116, 0121]).

As per claims 8, 17, Bloom discloses the system and service hub of claim 1, and 10 wherein the service hub is coupled to multiple service administrators associated with multiple service businesses (paragraphs [0021, 0038, 0064]).

As per claims 9, 18, Bloom does not explicitly discloses the system and service hub of claims 1 and 10 wherein the operational message includes access rights for the user subscribers.

However, the use and advantages of receiving access messages that define access rights of user subscribers and providing a portion of the service information based on the access rights is well-known to one of ordinary skill in the art as evidenced by Harvey (column 5, lines 20-20, column 26, lines 8-11, 27-60).

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to implement or incorporate Harvey's receiving access messages that define access rights of user subscribers and providing a portion of the service information based on the access rights in Bloom's system in order to determine who has access to resources and the type of access that have.

As per claim 20, Bloom does not explicitly discloses the method of claim 19, wherein the step of determining is a step of determining the access rights from an access message received at the service hub.

However, the use and advantages of receiving access messages that define access rights of user subscribers and providing a portion of the service information based on the access rights is well-known to one of ordinary skill in the art as evidenced by Harvey (column 5, lines 20-20, column 26, lines 8-11, 27-60).

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to implement or incorporate Harvey's receiving access messages that define access rights of user subscribers and providing a portion of the service information based on the access rights in Bloom's system in order to determine who has access to resources and the type of access that have.

As per claim 21, Bloom does not explicitly disclose the method of claim 19, wherein the step of determining is a step of determining the access rights from the at least one operational message.

However, the use and advantages of receiving access messages that define access rights of user subscribers and providing a portion of the service information based on the access rights is well-known to one of ordinary skill in the art as evidenced by Harvey (column 5, lines 20-20, column 26, lines 8-11, 27-60).

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to implement or incorporate Harvey's receiving access messages that define access rights of user subscribers and providing a portion of the service information based on the access rights in Bloom's system in order to determine who has access to resources and the type of access that have.

As per claim 22, Bloom discloses the method of claim 19, wherein the step of decoding is a step of decoding one or more macro message that represent the service information (paragraphs [0038, 0063, 0074, 0089, 0093])

As per claim 23, Bloom further discloses the method of claim 19 wherein the step of receiving a request further includes a step of authenticating the request (paragraphs [0014, 0035]).

As per claim 24, Bloom discloses the method of claim 19 wherein the step of receiving is a step of a request from a selected user subscriber via a communication network (paragraphs [0116, 0121]).

As per claim 25, Bloom does not explicitly discloses the method of claim 19 wherein the step of providing is a step of providing selected service information to a user subscriber when a trigger event occurs, wherein the selected service information is derived from the service information based on the access rights. However, the use and advantages of receiving access messages that define access rights of user subscribers and providing a portion of the service information based on the access rights is well-known to one of ordinary skill in the art as evidenced by Harvey (column 5, lines 20-20, column 26, lines 8-11, 27-60).

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to implement or incorporate Harvey's receiving access messages that define access rights of user subscribers and providing a portion of the service information based on the access rights in Bloom's system in order to determine who has access to resources and the type of access that have.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BARBARA N. BURGESS whose telephone number is (571)272-3996. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:00am-4:00pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571) 272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2157

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Barbara N Burgess/
Examiner, Art Unit 2157

Barbara N Burgess
Examiner
Art Unit 2157

March 30, 2008

/Ario Etienne/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2157